



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/696,618	10/29/2003	Allen A. Aradi	EI-7607	5585
34769	7590	09/11/2006	EXAMINER	
NEW MARKET SERVICES CORPORATION (FORMERLY ETHYL CORPORATION) 330 SOUTH 4TH STREET RICHMOND, VA 23219			TOOMER, CEPHIA D	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		1714		

DATE MAILED: 09/11/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/696,618	ARADI ET AL.
	Examiner Cephia D. Toomer	Art Unit 1714

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 June 2006.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This Office action is in response to the amendment filed June 16, 2006 in which claims 1, 12, 15 and 26 were amended.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-8, 12-22 and 26-28 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dorer (US 4,664,677).

Dorer teaches a fuel composition for internal combustion engines comprising a manganese containing compound and a copper containing compound (see abstract). The disclosure of internal combustion engine encompasses a spark ignited internal combustion engine having a fuel injection system and 6 or more cylinders as set forth in claims 12, 14, 26 and 28, absent evidence to the contrary. The compounds may be inorganic or organic. Examples of the inorganic compounds include manganese oxides, manganese hydroxides, manganese carbonates, copper oxides, copper hydroxides, manganese carbonates, copper oxides, copper hydroxides, and copper carbonates (see col. 1, line 65 through col. 2, lines 1-2). The organic compounds may be salts of carboxylic, sulfonic and phosphorus acid (see col. 2, lines 7-17). The fuel compositions have a combined manganese and copper content of about 1-1000 ppm and the fuel

Art Unit: 1714

may be gasoline (encompasses unleaded) or diesel (see col. 7, lines 13-18, 26-43,

Examples VI and VII).

Dorer teaches the limitations of the claims other than the methods of claims 1 and 15. However, the discovery of a previously unappreciated property of a prior art composition does not render the old composition patentably new to the discover. Thus the claiming of a new use, new function or unknown property does not necessarily make the claims patentable.

3. Claims 1-3, 6-10, 12-17, 20-24 and 26-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Henderson (US 3,179,506).

Henderson teaches a hydrocarbon fuel of gasoline (encompasses unleaded) for use in spark ignition internal combustion engines wherein the fuel comprises methylcyclopentadienyl manganese tricarbonyl (see claim 4). The disclosure of spark ignition internal combustion engines suggest a fuel injection system and 6 cylinder engine as set forth in claims 12, 14, 26 and 28 , absent evidence to the contrary. Henderson teaches that the fuel does not lay down combustion chamber deposits (see col. 2, lines 15-19). The manganese compound is present in the fuel in an amount up to 2 g/gal fuel (see col. 6, lines 26-30).

Henderson teaches the limitations of the claims other than the methods of claims 1 and 15. However, the discovery of a previously unappreciated property of a prior art composition does not render the old composition patentably new to the discover. Thus the claiming of a new use, new function or unknown property does not necessarily make the claims patentable.

4. Claims 11 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Henderson as applied to claims above, and further in view of Kaneko (US 5,401,280).

Henderson has been discussed above. Henderson fails to teach the sulfur content of the gasoline. However, Kaneko teaches this difference. Kaneko teaches gasoline compositions wherein the maximum sulfur content of the gasoline is 50 ppm or less (see col. 3, lines 15-20).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to select a gasoline comprising less than 30 ppm sulfur because Kaneko teaches that gasoline should have less than 50 ppm sulfur otherwise the exhaust gas cleaner would malfunction. Also, the greater the amount of sulfur that is present in the fuel the greater the amount of harmful SO_x emissions.

5. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that nowhere in the disclosure of the prior art is it a teaching of an advanced emissions control system or a direct injection gasoline engine. Applicant argues that the prior art teaches older technology engines and that these engines do not contain advanced emissions control systems. Applicant argues that the present invention is no mere discovery of a previously unappreciated property of a prior art composition.

The question to be answered here is whether or not the composition of Dorer and Henderson would reduce combustion deposit flaking, be it in a system that contains an advanced emissions control or in an older technology system that does not contain an

advanced emissions control. It is clear from reading the prior art that the metal compounds reduce deposits in combustion chambers. The degree of combustion chamber deposit flaking is irrelevant since the claims do not speak to this issue. Dorer and Henderson specifically teach that the metal compounds do inhibit deposits and the skilled artisan having a spark-ignited combustion engine having an advanced emissions control would have every expectation that the composition of Henderson and Dorer would reduce deposit flaking in the combustion chamber.

Applicant has not provided any data to show that the prior art composition would not perform the claimed method.

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cephia D. Toomer whose telephone number is 571-272-1126. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vasu Jagannathan can be reached on 571-272-1119. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Cephia D. Toomer
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1714

10696618\20060902